



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,046	05/22/2001	John J. Light	10559-455001	8351

7590 06/03/2005

Sharmini N. Green
c/o BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

KE, PENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/863,046

Applicant(s)

LIGHT ET AL.

Examiner

Peng Ke

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 12/27/04.

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent claims.

Claims 1, 9 and 17 were amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made. Claims 3-5, 8, 11-13, 16, 19-21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda, US-6,346,956.

Claims 1- 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda, US-6,346,956 in view of Cheng US-6396,509.

As per claim 1, Matsuda teaches a method of selecting a target object in a virtual three-dimensional space, comprising:

identifying objects, including the target object, in the virtual three-dimensional space (Fig. 27; col. 4, lines 22-23).

Matsuda does not specifically teach the method of determining distances between the objects and a point in the virtual three-dimensional space or the prioritizing of the objects based

Art Unit: 2174

on distances and identities of the objects and then selecting the target object from among the objects based on the priority assigned to the objects.

However, Cheng teaches the method of determining distances between the objects and a point in the virtual three-dimensional space or the prioritizing of the objects based on distances and identities of the objects and then selecting the target object from among the objects based on priority (*calculating distance between avatars*) (col. 7, lines 63-col. 8, lines 14). It would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Matsuda with Cheng's methods of determining distances and assigning priorities in order to create a method in which distance information between objects is maintained for tracking purposes and selection purposes based on selectivity/priority.

As per claims 3 and 4, Matsuda and Cheng teaches method as in claims 1 and 2. Cheng further teaches wherein prioritizing comprises assigning a higher priority to the non-link objects than to the link objects if the distances meet a predetermined criterion or assigning higher priority to the link object if the link object is closer to the point than a non-link object by a predetermined distance. (col. 7, lines 63-col. 8, lines 14)

As per claim 2, Matsuda teaches the method wherein the objects comprise one or more of a link object (anchor) and non-link object (col. 5, lines 41-52).

As per claim 6, Matsuda teaches the method wherein identifying comprises distinguishing between a link object and a non-link object (anchor objects vs. non-anchor objects) (Fig. 35; col. 37, lines 57-67).

As per claim 7, Matsuda teaches the method further comprising: receiving coordinates based on a user input; and locating the objects in the virtual three-dimensional space based on the coordinates (*detailed coordinate value information*) (Fig. 32; col. 33, lines 39-56).

As per claim 8, Matsuda and Cheng teach the method as in claim 1. Cheng further teaches wherein determining the distances comprises obtaining differences between coordinates in the virtual three-dimensional space for the objects and coordinates in the virtual three-dimensional space for the point. (col. 33, lines 34-40)

As per claims 9-12, 14-16, 17-20, and 22-24 they are the apparatus and article claims of claims 1-4, and 6 -8 and rejected on the same basis.

As per claim 5, Matsuda does not teach the method as in claim 1, wherein the predetermined distance comprises 0x1000000. However, official notice is taken that fixing predetermined distances of objects is well known in the art, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to fix the distance between linked and non-linked objects in order to for objects to be prioritized and selected.

As per claims 13 and 21 are the apparatus and article claims of claim 5 and are rejected on the same basis.

Art Unit: 2174

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100